



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,537	04/01/2004	Michael H. Dunn	871462.00024.PA1242380US	9994
26710	7590	02/12/2009		
QUARLES & BRADY LLP 411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE SUITE 2040 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497			EXAMINER	
			SHENG, TOM V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/816,537	Applicant(s) DUNN ET AL.
	Examiner TOM V. SHENG	Art Unit 2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10,13-30,32-36,40,41,43-84,88-101,103 and 104 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 61-67 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-10,13-16,19-30,40,41,43-52,68-72 and 88-101 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 17,18,32-36,53-60,73-84,103 and 104 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :7/10/08,9/12/08,12/17/08,8/7/07 (This 8/7/07 IDS is one of two that somehow not sent in last office action).

Claim Objections

1. Claim 44 is objected to because of the following informalities: "pull out window" should be "pull-out window" instead. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1, 2, 9, 10, 22, 25-30, 40, 41, 43, 48, 50-52, 69, 89 and 96-101 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Youden (US 7,027,035 B2).

As for claim 1 and associated claims 49, 68 and 88, Youden teaches a presentation system (image copy system 100; fig. 1; column 2, lines 40-59) for presenting information (displaying images), the system comprising:

a communication network (image data transfer link 110);
a control interface (selectable control 112);
a master presentation unit (computer system) including a processor (computing device 102) and a master display screen (first display device 104),
the master screen juxtaposed within the space so as to be viewable by an audience within a space (the first display device 104 is inherently viewed by an user and any other people within the vicinity),

the processor operable to transmit an image displayed on the master screen over the network upon user command issued via the control interface (when selectable control 112 is selected by the user, copy an image 116 displayed on the first display device 104 over to a second display device 108; column 2, lines 50-59); and

at least a first slave presentation unit (second display device 108) including a first slave image presenter (an inherent interface/driving circuitry that receives image data from computing device 102) operable to receive and present images that are transmitted by the master unit to the first slave unit over the network (image 116 is displayed on the second display device 108 via transfer link 110).

However, Youden is silent regarding whether the display at the master screen (first display device 104) and the first slave presentation unit (second display device 108) are for same audience.

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that whether the intended audience is same or separate groups relates simply to intended use of the image copy system. Moreover, it is conceivable and logical that the user of the image copy system is part of the audience. For example, the user first check and view an image displayed on the first display device, and when he desires to clearly show to the audience he could copy the image to the second display device, which could be a bigger display or simply another display at another spot within the space/room.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to setup the image copy system such that both display devices are within a space and intended for same audience.

As for claims 2, 69 and 89, providing a second slave presentation unit to the audience is both technically feasible and desirable with a big crowd.

As for claim 9, naturally each slave presentation unit would have its own display surface.

As for claim 10, managing the scales of both the master screen and presentation surface are both feasible and common in the art. This would be a matter of design consideration and usage preference.

As for claims 22 and 96, the master unit (computer system) does include the control interface (selectable control 112) as shown (fig. 1).

As for claims 25 and 97, Youden teaches an alternative wherein the control interface is separate from the master unit (selectable interface control 120 displayed on the first display device 104 - to be selected obviously by touch or associated mouse).

As for claims 26 and 98, the associated mouse could easily be a wireless mouse.

As for claims 27 and 99, Youden teaches that image data 116 and 118 are identical.

As for claims 28 and 100, the edit to image data 116 could be made updated with image data 118 by design once the copy button 112 has been selected.

As for claims 29, 30 and 101, it would have been obvious to make the link 110 wireless when this connectivity convenience is desired. Naturally, wireless transmitter and receiver would be required.

As for claims 40-41 and 50-52, the orientations and dimensions of the master and slave screens are simply a matter of design consideration in optimizing viewing space.

As for claim 43, whether the displays are adjacent to each other or spaced a distance apart is a matter of preference of the user for the audience.

As for claim 48, it is a matter of design consideration based on esthetics, functionality and portability on how the different displays should be provided.

4. Claims 3-5, 21, 70, 71, 90-92 and 95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Youden as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brown et al. (US 7,134,079 B2), hereinafter as Brown.

As for claims 3, 71 and 90, Youden does not teach the indicating of which slave units the image should be transmitted to. Brown teaches a presentation system 100 (fig. 1). Specifically, Brown teaches the system having a graphical interface 122, video outputs 116a, 116b provided to left-hand projector 114a and right-hand projector 114b, respectively. Using the interface 122, presentation material is directed to one, or both of the projectors (column 3, lines 12-26).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the features above of the graphical interface 122 could similarly be incorporated into Youden's selectable control as this would further allow control of which slave presentation unit is to be directed to. Therefore, it would have been obvious to further incorporate Brown's control interface features because of the selectivity of slave presentation unit provided.

As for claims 4 and 91, Brown teaches using graphical icons 620 and 644, to send image information to either left or right screen, that correspond to the two buttons provided in the master unit.

As for claims 5, 21, 70, 92 and 95, Youden does not teach that the image on the master screen is erased / removed after transmitting to a slave unit. On the other hand, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that once an image is transmitted to a slave unit, it is not necessary for the master screen to continue display the image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to remove / erase the image after being transmitted as a design choice.

5. Claims 6-8, 23-28, 72, 93, 94 and 97-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Youden as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Barton (US 2005/0193060 A1).

As for claims 6, 23 and 93, Youden does not teach an augment interface by which a presenter may augment an image presented on the master screen. On the other hand, Barton teaches a projected image (by display unit 120) may be edited by a control unit 130 (fig. 1 and 2; paragraph 26). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize Barton's editing feature could be incorporated into Youden's system and is beneficial in allowing a presentation image to be enhanced in real time as necessary. Therefore, it would have obvious to add Barton's editing feature as an enhancement to Youden's system.

As for claims 7, 24 and 94, the moving of the cursor and corresponding editing correspond to claimed activity intended to interact with the master screen.

As for claim 8, the adding or erasing of information is what editing is all about.

As for claims 25, 26, 97 and 98, Barton teaches an embodiment where the control unit 130 is separate from the display unit 120 (master display) and communicates wirelessly (via the document exchange unit 110, which could be part of the display unit 20).

As for claims 27 and 99, Barton teaches that the control unit 130 has a display 132 for preview.

As for claims 28 and 100, once the display data is sent to the shared memory 112, it is available for display on display unit 120.

Claim 72 is similarly rejected over the rationale of rejections for claims 6 and 7.

6. Claims 13-16, 19, 20 and 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Youden as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ayers et al. (US 5,038,158), hereinafter as Ayers.

As for claim 13, Youden does not teach the structure of the slave image presenter as claimed. Ayers teaches an erasable roller-type display (fig. 1 and 2). Specifically, the display has a roller 31, printer head 34, sheet feed motor 33 that correspond to claimed roll member, print applicator and motivator, respectively (column 5 lines 9-20). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that Ayers' display could similarly be used as one of Youden's secondary displays and is advantageous in

providing a feel of hand-drawn chart. Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate Ayers' display as one secondary display of Youden, providing a feel of a hand-drawn chart in presentation.

As for claim 14, the roller 31 rolls display sheet 22 that reads on claimed sheet of paper.

As for claims 15 and 16, it is not clear whether the primary display screen 56 and secondary display screens 58, 60 and 62 are of the same size. On the other hand, this would be simply being a matter of design consideration and usage preference.

As for claims 19 and 20, the display sheet 22 of Ayers is erasable. However, the erase is by means of a charged cleaning brush 66 and not erasable ink. On the other hand, the application of a cleaning agent is well known in the art and is merely an alternative to erasing content on a sheet medium. Moreover, the concurrent erasing and writing of content on a sheet medium is well known.

As for claims 44-47, Ayer's display is a pull-out endless loop type. However, this is simply a matter a design consideration for the four display styles as claimed are all well known in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 61-67 are allowed.
8. Claims 17, 18, 32-36, 53-60, 73-81, 82-84 and 103-104 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in

independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior art of record teaches, *inter alia*, the correlation between the presentation unit and the images presented, as claimed.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments, see pages 19-20, filed 10/27/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Youden and Brown.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment (with affidavit) necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TOM V. SHENG whose telephone number is (571)272-7684. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on (571) 272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tom Sheng

/Richard Hjerpe/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629